

Remarks

Claims 1, 14, 21 and 26 have been amended. New claims 35-37 have been added. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments. Applicants seek to place the claims in more suitable condition for US prosecution.

Rejections under 35 USC 112

Applicant has amended claims 14, 21 and 26 in line with examiner's suggestion to depend on claim 12, rather than claim 11 to overcome this objection.

Rejections under 35 USC 112

Applicant has amended claim 1 to emphasize the distinction over Garrett (US 3,754,609). Specifically Garrett is concerned with a wholly different context in teaching a steel sleeve that is constructed of sufficient length to allow it be more elastically deformable within the elastic limits of the steel. This deformability being used to allow flexibility of the sleeve while preventing leaking and maintaining maximum torque to be transmitted.

However, claim 1 differs from Garrett in teaching a stabilizer having an elastic part that is deformable "compensating for play that may appear later between the stabilizer (1) and the rod (2) in order to fix the stabilizer in a predetermined position with respect to the rod" (as described in the first and second paragraphs of the 'Description of the Invention as filed).

Garrett specifically intends flexibility to prevent leaks, which means the sleeve not only needs to be long, but will shift its position in relation to the drill string. Instead for the present application, cooperation of the elastic part with the shoulder maintains the rod in a predetermined position with respect to the stabilizer and keep the stabilizer in place regardless of the conditions of use (see page 3 lines 25).

This has several advantages in compensating for rods that may be stressed for elongation, compression or radially due to a pressure and/or temperature differentials (see page 2 lines 15-25) or for required fixed orientation in the case of nuclear measurements (see the paragraph spanning pages 2 and 3).

New claims 35 to 37 are based on features of previous claims 1 combined with the subject matter of claims 7, 9 and 11 respectively, which was deemed by the examiner to be allowable.


Applicant submits that amendments overcome the examiners objections and that the present application is now in condition for allowance.

This paper is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed May 23, 2007 for which the three-month date for response was August 23, 2007. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), Applicants petition for an extension of time of two months in which to respond to the Office Action. This two month extension will bring the deadline for response to October 23, 2007 which is within the six-month statutory period.

Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-2183 (Reference Number 21.1073).

Dated: 10/23/07

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Matthias Abrell
Registration No.: 47377
Schlumberger Technology Corp.
200 Gillingham Lane
Sugar Land, TX 77478
281-285-8809 (tel)
281-285-8821 (fax)